UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,230	11/13/2006	Hiroyuki Sato	2006_1547A	7037

513 7590 03/18/2011

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
1030 15th Street, N.W.,
Suite 400 East
Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER	
MESH, GENNADIY	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1763	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/18/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
eoa@wenderoth.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/593,230	SATO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GENNADIY MESH	1763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 May 2010 and 27 May 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5,8 and 10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5,8 and 10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 4, 2010 has been entered.

1.2. Applicant's amendment filed on May 4, 2010 is acknowledged.

Claims 3-4, 6-7and 9 have been canceled by Applicant. Claim 10 is newly added. Claim 1 has been amended. Support for amendment of Claim1 and new Claim 10 has been found in Specification as indicated by Applicant. Thus, no new matter has been added to the claimed subject matter.

1.3. New Grounds of rejection are introduced due to amendment.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-2, 5, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeProspero (US 3,565,869 - reference cited by Applicant) combined

with Yamane et al. (US 2003/0125431) and in further view of Terado et al. (US 6,528,617).

Regarding Claims 1-2, 5, 8 and 10 DeProspero disclosed process for producing polyglycolic acid, substantially free from as residual glycolide and content of other volatile impurities below 0.2% (see abstract and column2, lines 60 - 63) by subjecting solid particles of polyglycolic acid to solid state heat treatment with heated and dried (moisture and oxygen free) inert gas (see Abstract) at temperature from 20 ^{o}C to 190 ^{o}C and reduced pressure- see column 3, lines 14 - 34.

DeProspero is silent regarding the step of adding heat stabilizer during pelletizing of polyglycolic acid particles and additional step of heat treatment under **normal pressure**, as it required by amended claim 1, but DeProspero points out that heat treatment conducted at higher pressure will require longer time and lower contact temperatures in order to reduced impurities due to instability and degradation of fine particles of polyglycolic acid (see DeProspero column 4, lines 4-29).

However, Yamane, teaches that (see [0021]) "When the method in which heat history is applied to polyglycolic acid and the method in which the heat stabilizer is added to crystalline polyglycolic acid is used in combination, a polyglycolic acid composition modified in thermal properties and moreover improved in melt stability can be provided".

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to add heat stabilizer to polyglycolic acid per teaching of Yamane in order to increased thermal stability of the polyglycolic acid obtain by process disclosed by DeProspero.

As explain above DeProspero combined with Yamane is silent regarding additional heat treatment step at conducted at normal pressure.

However, Terado teaches solid phase polymerization of aliphatic polyester with following additional heat treatment step, under flow of gas at normal pressure in order to minimized residual monomer content below 1000 ppm (see column 2, lines 50 - 60 , column 3, lines 35 -65 and Examples).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add additional step of heat treatment at flow of gas at normal pressure per teaching of Terado in order to decrease residual cyclic ester below 1000 ppm in process disclosed by DeProspero combined with Yamane.

Regarding limitation of Claims 8 and 10 related to particle size - see DeProspero column 4, lines 18 - 33.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5, 7 , 8 and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Applicant's arguments related to Claims 1-2, 5, 8 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeProspero (US 3,565,869 - reference cited by Applicant) combined with Yamane et al.(US 2003/0125431) and in further view of Terado et al (US 6,528,617) based on following:

a) applicant stated that Claim 1 has been amended to recite that cyclic ester comprises "glycolide or a mixture of glycolide and lactide containing more than 70wt.% of the glycolide"

Note, that this limitation is satisfied by DeProspero, because DeProspero disclosed process for polymerization of glycolide.

b) Applicants stated that after polymerization polyester pelletized with thermal stabilizer - this limitation is satisfied by DeProspero combined with Yamane (see rejection above).

c) Applicants stated that process required additional step of heat treatment at normal pressure - this limitation is taught by combination of DeProspero, Yamane and Terado - see rejection above.

Therefore, Applicant's arguments were found unpersuasive.

DeProspero and specific benefits of Applicant's invention were found unpersuasive for following reasons:

a) Applicant stated: "...The step of contact with a flowing heated dry gas under normal pressure **is not as effective as application of a reduced pressure** as far as the residual monomer reduction effect is concerned, but is safe and suited for mass production (page 13, lines 17-19). In order to compensate for such a relatively low residual".

It is noted that Applicant admitted that process claimed by Applicant is not an efficient process as disclosed by DeProspero. It is not clear, why process disclosed by Applicant is more save than process disclosed by DeProspero. It is also noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **safe process**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from

the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

b) Applicant also stated that: Table 1 on page 25 of the specification, Comparative Example 1 (polymerization temperature: 170 °C) represents solid-phase polymerization, and Comparative Example 4 (polymerization temperature: 230 °C) represents non- solid-phase polymerization (or melt polymerization). Comparing these Examples, it is clear that solid-phase polymerization (residual monomer (glycolide): 0.35 wt.% in Comparative Example 1) is more advantageous than non- solid-phase polymerization (residual monomer: 1.0 wt.% in Comparative Example 4)".

This argument was found unpersuasive, because DeProspero discloses Solid-phase process at temperatures in a range from 20 ^{0}C to 190 ^{0}C, significantly below 230C and in a range claimed by Applicant.

c) Regarding Applicant's statement that: ... " the residual monomer content below 0.2 wt.% aimed at by the present invention cannot be achieved by only the solid-phase polymerization." note, that DeProspero disclosed that this level, below 0.2 wt% of residual monomer and other volatile impurities is achieved by Solid phase process (see rejection above, paragraph 2 and DeProspero (see abstract and column2, lines 60 - 63).

At least for reasons above Applicant's arguments were found unpersuasive.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GENNADIY MESH whose telephone number is (571)272-2901. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 a.m - 6 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272 1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Milton I. Cano/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1763

Gennadiy Mesh
Examiner
Art Unit 1763

/GM/